

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

In the non-final action, dependent claims 8 and 18 are indicated to be allowable, and all other claims (i.e., claims 1-7, 9-17, 19, and 20) are rejected.

More particularly, dependent claims 6 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. And, dependent claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,332,196 to Kawasaki et al. (hereinafter “Kawasaki”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,813,022 to Ramsey et al. (hereinafter “Ramsey”). Also, claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-13, 15-17, 19, and 20 (which include independent claims 1, 9, 11, 19, and 20, which are the only pending independent claims) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Kawasaki.

Applicants disagree with the rejection of dependent claims 6 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants submit that dependent claims 6 and 16 are fine as originally filed and that they are in no way indefinite. In the interest of moving to allowance as soon as possible, however, and without agreeing with or acquiescing to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, applicants have amended dependent claims 6 and 16 slightly. Support can be found throughout the originally filed application and at, for example, page 24, line 10.

Also, applicants traverse the rejection of claim 1-3, 5-7, 9-13, 15-17, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Kawasaki. When the passages of Kawasaki identified in the non-final action (e.g., lines 28-48 of column 13, and from line 49 of column 13 to line 16 of column 14) are examined carefully, it is clear that Kawasaki discloses not what applicants recite in independent claims 1, 9, 11, 19, and 20 but instead stopping “power supply by the power control section **215** to the hardware components (R/W-related circuits) relating to the disk access” (lines 34-36 of column 13) whenever “the buffer memory **211** has become full and the preread” cache operation has stopped (lines 33-34

of column 13 and also lines 28-32 of column 13). In Kawasaki, whenever there is “space in the buffer memory **211**, the CPU **20** controls the power control section **215** and resumes power supply to the hardware components relating to the disk access” (line 65 of column 13 to line 1 of column 14). Kawasaki thus clearly discloses stopping the supply of power whenever the buffer memory is full, and resuming the supply of power whenever there is space in the buffer memory. While this may result in a “reduction in power consumption in a disk access operation” (lines 7-8 of column 1 of Kawasaki), it is not a disclosure of at least the following aspects of the pending independent claims: (i) inhibiting access to an external memory when the processing of a task is possible only with access to a cache (and not with any access to the external memory); and (ii) stopping the supply of power to the external memory when access to the external memory is inhibited.

Each of the pending independent claims recites stopping the supply of power to an external memory when access to the external memory is inhibited and that such access is inhibited when a task can be processed by just access to a cache. The supply

of power to the external memory is stopped when a task can be processed by just access to a cache. In sharp contrast, Kawasaki clearly requires that the buffer memory be full to stop the supply of power. Kawasaki simply is disclosing something different than what is recited in each of the pending independent claims, and those claims thus are patentable over Kawasaki. And, consequently, each of the claims that depend from those independent claims also is patentable.


Applicants also traverse the rejection of dependent claims 4 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kawasaki in view of Ramsey. Ramsey is deficient at least in the same way that Kawasaki is deficient, and thus the combination of the two could and would not have resulted in the subject matter recited in the pending independent claims or then any of the pending dependent claims.

In view of the foregoing, applicants request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-20 in due course.

Applicants submit that no extension petition or fees are due to have this Response to Non-Final Action entered and considered. However, if for any reason an extension petition is required and/or a fee is required, please consider this a conditional petition for the necessary extension and/or a conditional authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 04-1105.

Date: September 8, 2006
Customer No.: 21874

Respectfully Submitted,

By: 
Robert J. Tosti

Reg. No. 35,393

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205
Tel: (617) 517-5584
Fax: (617) 439-4170